..Our Boys and Girls..

Edited by Aunt Busy.

This department is conducted solely in the interests of our girl and boy readers.

Aunt Busy is glad to hear any time from the nieces and nephews who read this page, and to give them all the advice and help in her power.

Write on one side of the paper only.

Do not have letters too long.

Original stories and verses will be gladly received and carefully edited.

The manuscrips of contributions not accepted will be returned.

Address all letters to Aunt Busy, Intermountain Catholic, Salt Lake City.

THEY'LL NEVER BE LITTLE AGAIN.

Oh bring yourself down to your little one's grief
And give to his infantile troubles relief;
Don't turn him away with a word and a frown,
Though he seems like a cross he will turn to a crown.
The "mother boys" always have made the best men—
And they'll never be little again.

Don't spend all your time over fashion's demands,
Or over the heathen in far away lands;
Tho' well in their way they can never compare
With the good you may do to the children you bear.
They may go from you, too, and you can not tell when—
And they'll never be little again.

It will not be lost, all the care you bestow,
When unto the years of discretion they grow:
They will be the kinder when you are grown old,
Your day will go down in a sunset of gold.
The reward of your toil it will come to you then—
But they'll never be little again.

—I. Ritchey.

AUNT BUSY HAS HER SAY.

Dear Nieces and Nephews: Aunt Busy this week closes her Thanksgiving day story contest and she hopes to announce the winners next week. As told to you before, she will not decide the prize winners, nor will any of The Intermountain staff. Two members of the Salt Lake Herald and two of the Salt Lake Tribune staff have kindly consented to act as judges, so Aunt Busy's dear girls and boys will have to accept the decision of four very clever, bright newspaper men. Aunt Busy hopes to start another interesting contest right after Christmas, and hopes that the dear nieces and nephews will take an interest in entering their names. Next week the names of the girl and boy who were successful in this contest will be announced. Aunt Busy intends to publish their pictures, too, if she can get them. Lovingly. AUNT BUSY.

CONTESTANTS FOR AUNT BUSY'S PRIZES.

Miss Elizabeth Burns, 314 Center street, Salt Lake City.
John E. Ducey of Denver.
Miss Nellie Clancy of Butte.
Miss Mary Vezzette of Brookside, Colo.
Miss Nora Crawford, 234 B street, Salt Lake.
Joseph Thomas, Salt Lake.
Miss Mamie McNamara, Tuscarora, Nev.
Miss Ethel Patton, Dewey, Mont.
Leigh Sullivan, Lewiston, Mont.
Thomas Loughlin, Salt Lake.
Georgia Sullivan, Cheyenne, Wyo.
Clara Hughes, Salt Lake.
Alice E. Lackey, Rawlins, Wyo.
Joseph Richards, Fort Collins, Colo.
Agnes Richards, Fort Collins, Colo.
Alice Kost, Evanston, Wyo.
Alice Dollinger, Colorado Springs, Colo.

LETTERS AND ANSWERS.

Fort Collins, Colo., Nov. 28, 1904.

Dear Aunt Busy: Can you give me a little corner in your heart. I am 9 years old, in the fifth grade and do hope I can win the prize. At least I am going to try, as my brother Joe is trying, too. Only it would be too long and take up too much space, I could tell about the Pilgrims, so I have put it into as few lines as possible so you can read it. Hope to hear from Aunt Busy and that your little niece from Fort Collins has won the prize. Lovingly yours. AGNES RICHARD.

1112 South Remington Street.

Yes, Aunt Busy has a big corner in her heart for the dear niece from Fort Collins. She hopes to hear often from the little stranger for the future. You have the right idea for newspaper writing, Alice, when you make your story as short and complete as possible. Success for the prize, little niece.

Evanston, Wyo., Dec. 2, 1904.

My Dear Aunt Busy: Have been thinking several times of writing to you, but from mere neglect have failed to do so. I am 12 years of age and a student of the seventh grade. I have a nice teacher—her name is Mrs. Norwood. I hope some time to be up in Salt Lake and will come to see you, as we have a few friends there. I guess they know where you live. I am going to be one of the contestants, as I have not seen any letters or stories from Evanston.

We have taken The Intermountain Catholic for a number of years and like it very much. I think I will close, as it is getting late. From your niece, ALICE FRANCES KOST.

Aunt Busy has a warm welcome for the dear little Evanston niece. She will be pleased to see you whenever you come to Salt Lake. She appreciatesyour kind words for The Intermountain Catholic and hopes to hear from you often.

Fort Collins, Colo., Nov. 28, 1904.

Dear Aunt Busy: One strange little nephew has entered the contest. Both I and my sister are trying to get the prize. I am 12 years old and in the sixth grade. I spent my Thanksgiving in Longmont with my cousin. Your little nephew, JOE RICHARD.

Aunt Busy has a glad welcome for the little nephew from Fort Collins. Why have you never written to Aunt Busy before? Now that we are acquainted perhaps we will hear very often from each other, so remember, Joseph, that Aunt Busy will not forget you.

SHORT COMPETITIVE ESSAYS.

Aunt Busy's Boys and Girls Present Observations on Thanksgiving.

Thanksgiving day was first held by the Pilgrims in 1621. Before telling how they kept it, I must tell why they kept it.

They left England to come to America to worship God as they pleased. In the spring of 1621 they planted corn and pumpkin seed. About the middle of the summer everything was dying, even the colonists, for fear a famine would come, but they prayed, and rain soon came.

Governor Bradford set aside a day for feasting and thanksgiving for the mercies God had shown them. When it came they invited Massiot and ninety other Indians with whom they had lived in peace and harmony. They popped corn and had pumpkin pies, and gave thanks to God.

Thus the governor of each state issues a proclamation setting aside the last Thursday of November of each year a day of thanksgiving and feasting. ALICE KOST, Evanston.

Fort Collins, Colo., Nov. 28, 1904.

The last Thursday in the month of November was set apart for thanks to God for his blessings of mankind. They way in which thanksgiving came to be was that there were a few people who lived in England believed or worshipped God somewhat different than the other English people. So the Pilgrims, as they were called, went away to Holland. They got tired of Holland because if they stayed in there they would take up Dutch fashions and drop the English ways. So they left Holland and went to America. They way in which they came was in two ships, one the Mayflower and the other the Speedwell, which was very weak and after being left behind because of leaks that sprung, the Mayflower went on alone. It was in many storms and was a long time getting to America. But at last the ship sailed up Plymouth harbor. They landed and had a week of prayer and feasting, so this is the reason that Lincoln set apart a day of thanksgibing in November—the last Thursday—it was in the year 1863. So we can see that we follow some of the ways of the early settlers.

JOSEPH RICHARD, Fort Collins, Colo.

Fort Collins, Colo., Nov. 28, 1904.

Thanksgiving day, since 1863, has been set apart as a legal holiday by every president since Abraham Lincoln's time. A day for thanks to be given to God for his goodness to mankind. From every heart and tongue praises are given for the year so soon to be past. The next thought is a good dinner. Turkey is the favorite meat, as the Pilgrims used the wild turkey, which they had to shoot in order to get something to eat. Is it any wonder they gave thanks to God for their safe voyage, after spending so many days in hardships. They were a brave set, for when they Mayflower went back not one of this band returned with it. Many tears were brushed away when they saw the good ship sail away, but preferred our own dear America to the cruel king of England. God bless our country, the home of the free, and Thanksgiving day. AGNES RICHARD.

Fort Collins, Colo.

Thanksgiving first originated from the Pilgrims. They came over to the New World in 1620 and settled mostly in the New England states. Most of them had farms. They all had large crops and after the harvesting was over they set aside a day to thank God for the good crops.

Then they had a feast to which they invited some of the friendly Indians. This is when Thanksgiving first originated, and it has been observed ever since. ALICE DOLLINGER.

118 W. Vermijo, Colorado Springs, Colo.

TALKS TO BOYS.

Be honest, boys. "Honesty is the best policy," the proverb says. Surely, it is. Look at it from any side you wish. The best policy, both for your spiritual, as well as temporal welfare. Learn from the experience of others that honesty is a most necessary virtue.

Honesty is necessary, especially for boys. The boys are our future men. As such they will be the main factors of men to one another. It is extremely necessary that they be honest. Will they be it, if they have not learned to be honest when they were boys? Will they be honest in important things, if they have not learned to be so in less important ones? Surely not. See, then, boys, how you should strive to acquire a spirit of honesty, even now in the small dealings you have with your fellow men.

Many of our boys are not honest. They steal, steal not exactly big things, but small ones. They are not honest. An honest boy will never steal, even the minutest article. Some boys think they are quite honest, but when temptation comes and they have a good chance to steal something, they fall and act very dishonestly. Dishonesty can be detected already in the small boy. When his mamma sends him to the grocery to buy something he keeps the change. He is dishonest. He thinks perhaps he is smart, but he is not. It doesn't take a smart head to plan such a dishonest act. Some boys take the pennies lying around on the tables or in the pantries of their homes. They are dishonest, because they steal. They don't steal all the change they find, but only a few pennies; nevertheless, they are dishonest. Honesty excludes every act of stealing, though small the theft may be. Some boys cheat their comrades in the games they play; they are dishonest. Some boys feel proud and boast if they have passed off a counterfeit coin without being detected; they are dishonest. Some boys keep small amounts back from their week's wages and deceive their parents as to what they really earn; they are dishonest. An honest boy will never attempt such things. An honest boy will never steal, no matter how small the amount, how alluring the occasion, how secure the chance. If you were left alone for weeks with a stack of pennies ten feet high, which had not been counted and would not steal a single one, then you would be honest. And how many boys would be honest in such a temptation? Still, all boys should be honest. How about that, boys? Are you honest? If not, be it. Learn to be honest. —Rev. M. Klasen in the Mirror.

A PHILANTHROPIC PRINCE.

It was in July, 1865, at Carlsbad. A large throng of elegantly dressed promenaders assembled in the court around the music pavilion; and among them was a tall, distinguished looking gentleman who was the cynosure of all eyes. Annoyed, evidently, by this open curiosity, the gentleman walked away and entered one of the avenues, where a pale-faced little girl approached him, holding out her hand.

"Who sent you out to beg, my child?" asked the gentleman.

"My sick mother," was the reply.

"What does your father do?"

"He is dead and we are so hungry," said the girl, bursting into tears.

The gentleman had taken out his purse, but he put it back again and said:

"Show me where your mother lives."

The girl led the way through the streets into an alley, and stopped before an old house.

"She lives here, sir."

They entered the house and climbed up the rickety stairs to an attic. There in a corner, on a straw pallet, lay a young woman wasted to a shadow by hunger and disease.

As the two entered, the poor woman half rose from her bed and said:

"Oh, sir, my little girl should not have brought you here, for I have no money to pay you for your services!"

"Have you no one to help you?" asked the supposed doctor.

"No one; the other people in the house are very poor themselves."

Upon hearing this, the visitor took out his purse and gave the child money to buy food and wine. He then took his leave, and soon afterward one of the principal physicians in the city entered the humble abode. On seeing this second visitor, the woman was perplexed.

"Sir," she said, hesitatingly, "my little girl has made a mistake in calling you in; a doctor has already been here and prescribed wine for me."

"But that gentleman was not a physician, and it was he who sent me to you," was the kind rejoinder.

The gentleman who had accompanied the little girl to her poverty-stricken home was the Czarowitz of Russia, who afterward came to the throne, and whose untimely death, at the hands of an assassin, caused universal mourning.—Ave Maria.

NOTHING NEW.

There is nothing new in the much-advertised "Simple Life." In telling the other day in Carnegie hall how he came to write it, Pastor Wagner said:

"It was all a mere accident. One day I spoke at a wedding where there were only six persons present. My talk was on simplicity in the household, in the inner life of the home, and I said that, first of all there should be mutual love and that we should put behind everything that tends to prevent us from loving each other."

This, of course, is excellent, but it is not a new discovery. It is part of the teaching of the founder of Christianity and of the Catholic church for nineteen centuries.—Freeman's Journal.

The Diversities of Socialism.

(Chicago Tribune.)

There are several principles for the adoption of which practically all the socialists in the world contend. They all want absolute democracy. They all stand for a thorough and comprehensive system of public education. They all demand public ownership and management of all the instruments of production and distribution. They denounce as wholly unjust the division of the aggregate income of capital and labor which is made under the existing industrial system, and demand unanimously the adoption of a more equitable basis of distribution.

But, despite the general harmony of view regarding these leading principles, there is much discord within the socialist camp. Most of it arises over minor points, but much of it is due to differences over matters of fundamental importance. The German social democracy is menaced with a bad split., England and her "Social Democratic federation," her "Socialist league," her "Fabian society," her "Christian Social society," her "Guild of St. Matthews," and any number of lesser socialist organizations. In France there are "collectivists," "Blanquists," Broussist "possibilits," Allemanist "possibilists," "independents"; and one of these parties can hardly meet without being rent asunder. The socialists of the United States are fairly harmonious now, but their past history is largely a history of splits. Each of the numerous factions in the various countries represents a different shade of doctrine. It would take a book to elucidate all the diversities of socialism.

Running through the socialist ranks everywhere, however, is one line of cleavage which stands out most distinctly. This is the line which in every country divides the "opportunist," or "reformist," from the "scientific," or "revolutionary," socialists. The revolutionary socialists are led in Germany by Bebel and Liebknecut, in France by Guesde and Lafargue, in Italy by Ferri, in England by Hyndman. The opportunists are led in Germany by Bernstein and Vollmaar, in France by Jaures and Millerand, in Italy by Turati, in England by Kier Hardie. The socialist party in the United States is dominated by revolutionary sentiment and by revolutionary leaders, such as Eugene V. Debs and A. M. Simons of Chicago, the able editor of the International Socialist Review.

The revolutionists, who are usually devout believers in the entire gospel according to Marx, maintain that the socialist propaganda is a war of the laboring class, or proletariat, against all other classes of society. They would, therefore, organize the proletarians into a party from which all other persons were barred, so that when in the course of industrial evolution, the capitalistic system breaks down the proletarians will be ready to seize the instruments of production and distribution and begin managing them in the interest of the whole people. Meantime, they would have socialists accept no favors from or offices—except for purposes of agitation—under governments which they regard as capitalistic, but would have them stand aloof and wage unrelenting war against established institutions. Opportunists believe, on the contrary, that the interests of all classes are pretty much the same. They deprecate class war, and would debar nobody from socialist ranks. The revolutionists would accomplish the change to socialism, without violence, if possible, but quite suddenly. The opportunists, as their name implies, would welcome every gain, however slight, for socialism, and would bring the new regime to pass by slow, almost imperceptible, degrees.

As would naturally be expected, England, the classic land of liberty, practical philosophy, and opportunism, is the happy hunting ground of the reformists. There is less socialism in theory and more in practice in that country than in any other in the world. The English national and municipal governments do everything, from delivering the mails and operating street railways to running pawnshops and cow meadows and furnishing midwives. The revolutionary socialists, as would also be anticipated, are strongest in Germany, whose philosophy has always been theoretical and idealistic, and whose government has always been despotic.

The revolutionists believe, with Marx and Engels, that government will be practically abolished under socialism. "The state's seizure of the means of production in the name of society," says Engels, "is . . . its last independent act as a state." There will be no cabinets, parliaments, standing armies, police, courts, attorneys, or taxation under socialism, according to Bebel, the German leader. Their place will be taken by administrative boards. This view seems largely a reaction against the tyranny of European—and especially of the German—governments. It seldom appears in the talk or books of the English Fabians and other reformist socialists.

The question which causes the most severe dissension among socialists on the continent of Europe is as to what position they shall take in reference to the land problem. Land is one of the chief instruments of production, and the strict Marxian doctrine is that it, like every other form of private capital, must be appropriated and managed by and for the public or "collectively." The peasant farmers of Germany, France, and Italy, who own the little patches of land they cultivate, love them as they do their wives and babes; and fear of loss of their small properties has caused them almost to a man to oppose socialism. The peasant proprietors are numerous, and socialism can hardly win against their opposition. The opportunists would meet the difficulty by telling the peasants that private property in land will not be disturbed under a socialist regime until the tendency of capital to centralize shall have vested ownership of it in a few hands. The revolutionists oppose giving any such assurances. They would have land seized along with stores, manufactures, and other instruments of production.

The socialists of England are not troubled by this agrarian question. Ownership of the land of England, like ownership of its manufactures, is already centralized in a few hands. There are no peasant farmers to "expropriate." Immediate public ownership or "naturalization," of land is consequently as fundamental a tenet in the creed of the English opportunist as it is in that of the German or French revolutionist.

On most points the socialists of the United States are in harmony with the revolutionary socialists of Germany.

Whether they will follow them and the English socialists on the land question is a matter for interesting conjecture. American socialist leaders plainly see that for their party to declare flatly for immediate public ownership of arable land would be to gain the hostility of all the millions of American farmers who own their farms. How to be consistent in their principles and yet not array the farmers against them is a problem which, as one of them admitted the other day, is "keeping American socialist leaders awake nights."

The chief aim of socialists is a more equitable system of distribution of the produce of society, but there is no agreement among them as to what system shall be adopted. Saint Simon favored rewarding each person according to his capacity. Louis Blanc advocated giving to each according to his needs. Many socialists believe all should receive the same income. The more orthodox Marxists do not tackle the problem of distribution, but content themselves with the fatalistic position that the same process of evolution which is tending to vest the ownership and management of the instruments of production in the collectivity will also work out an equitable scheme for dividing the products. S. O. D.

THE STAGE AND CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

May Irwin is well known as a good Catholic, and a very popular actress. It is seldom, however, that we see professional people sinking their popularity and taking a hand in the wider seriousness of life for conviction sake. May Irwin, comedienne and footlight favorite, has been doing this, making indeed a public statement of her belief in the necessity of Catholic schools. Viewing life as she has observed it, and knowing its recompenses as she has practiced it, May Irwin says:

"I know the stage of today. I know that it reflects the current philosophies of life. Almost every play that is popularly called serious is tinctured with irreligion. Many of these are thoughtful, original—and startling. Pinero, as an example. He is an immense, though sordid, technical force. And when the amusement-loving public which devotes its leisure moments to swallowing his ethics in capsule form have completed the task—what then? Where are the bases of the moral law? Is not religion as an exalted way of viewing life sneered at—or worse still subtly ignored? What safeguards for the morals of the young man are set up? Absolutely none!

"I knew that my children would be interested in the things in which cultivated people everywhere are interested. I was sure that they would see and enjoy Pinero, Ibsen, and the technical craftsmen of the modern drama. Would their belief in a law and a law giver remain? What would shelter their sense of right—unless it were enforced by the sanctions of a religious education?

"I saw that a time would come in my relation with my children when the final appeal would be to God—not the dim, 'unsectarian' Jehovah or Lord—but to the judging Christ! Without a religious education their minds might be highly cultivated—reflecting life at many points. Should they turn to the Bible as a refuge amid the storms? Why should they? They would have been taught that the Bible is among the masterpieces of literary art—that it ranks with Homer, Goethe and Shakespeare as a literary document. But the face of Christ would not shine from its pages. What else could I do but send them to a Catholic institution where religion would be an effective force—a real spiritual power? This I did. And the results were richly satisfactory."

May Irwin is no convert to these convictions. Her two handsome sons are cadets at De La Salle academy, New York City, and their upbringing has been entirely within Catholic influence. Such is the Catholic mother.